

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 15 - 501 Teff
Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME D UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL AGOV 10 2015
Clifton Chatman) Defendant.)	CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on November 10, 2015 to November 10 by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the pub 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases	2015, the Court excludes time under the where 23, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served lic and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. 8
Failure to grant a continuance would be l See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ikely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unre necessary for effective preparation, taking See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	easonably deny the defendant the reasonable time into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	(12)
DATED: 11-16-15	LAUREL BEELER
A Maria	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney